UNITED	STATI	ES DIST	ΓRICT	COURT
DISTRI	CT OF	MASS	ACHU:	SETTS

RICHARD E. KAPLAN,	) )
Plaintiff,	)
v.	)
FIRST HARTFORD CORPORATION,	)
Defendant.	) ) )

## PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE

The Plaintiff hereby moves the Court for leave to file a Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Motion for Continuance. The Defendant FHC has misstated several facts in its opposition, and the Plaintiff will correct the record with this brief reply.

Attached to this Motion and marked <u>Exhibit A</u> is the Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Motion for Continuance.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD E. KAPLAN, Plaintiff,

By his attorneys,

/s/ Larry C. Kenna

Larry C. Kenna (BBO No. 267760) Robert Rothberg (BBO No. 430980) CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP Two International Place Boston, Massachusetts 02110 (617) 248-5000

Dated: April 20, 2006

4072601v1

## Exhibit A

UNITED	<b>STATES</b>	DISTRICT	COURT
DISTRI	CT OF M	IASSACHU	JSETTS

Page 2 of 3

)	
)	
)	C.A. No. 04-10402-NMG C.A. No. 05-10320-NMG
)	C.A. No. 03-10320-NMC
)	
	)

## PLAINTIFF RICHARD E. KAPLAN'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE

Plaintiff would like to respond, briefly, to some of the mischaracterizations contained in Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for a Continuance.

As indicated in Defendant's Response, the parties are preparing for a July trial in the District of Maine. If Plaintiff is successful in the Maine litigation, this case will become moot. For this reason, Plaintiff has suggested continuing this case until September -- i.e. pending the outcome of the Maine trial.

Defendant's Opposition to the Motion for Continuance gives the impression that the parties were scheduled to mediate this case. That is not entirely true. When the Court asked the parties to disclose whether there was anything that might dispose of this case without trial, Plaintiff's counsel stated that the parties had a mediation scheduled for April 26. A better (i.e. more complete) statement would have been that the parties had a mediation scheduled for April 26 that would focus on the Maine case, and that a resolution of the Maine case would also dispose of this case. There is nothing inconsistent in Plaintiff's positions that (a) he does not want to delay the Maine case, (b) it makes sense to continue this trial until September, (c) if the

trial in these cases is to be on May 1, the Plaintiff wants to be prepared for it, and (d) in the short time available, Plaintiff cannot both prepare these cases for trial and mediate the Maine case.

However, it is for the Court, and not the parties, to decide whether judicial economy would be best served by continuing this case until after the Maine trial. Pending further order of the Court, the Plaintiff will be preparing for trial beginning May 1.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD E. KAPLAN, Plaintiff,

By his attorneys,

/s/ Larry C. Kenna

Larry C. Kenna (BBO No. 267760) Robert Rothberg (BBO No. 430980) CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP Two International Place Boston, Massachusetts 02110 (617) 248-5000

Dated: April 20, 2006

4072612v1